

**REMARKS**

The amendment to claim 9 and new claims 18-24 are supported by the specification and contain no new matter. For example, the amendment to claim 9 and new claims are supported by the original claims; Claim 20 are p. 8, lines 24-25 and Claim 21 at p. 15, lines 1-5.

**§ 112 Rejections**

Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards (or Applicants regard) as the invention.

Applicant has cancelled the claims drawn to the invention of non-elected Group I, claims 1-8 and 13, drawn to a flexible mold and to withdrawn claims 13-17, drawn to a method of making a mold.

**Information Disclosure Statement**

The Applicant submits that both WO 01/5229 and WO 2004/007166 were submitted. The Form PTO-1449 that included WO 2004/007166 was initialized by the Examiner and included with the Office Action of June 12, 2006. In the Office Action of July 5, 2007, the Examiner acknowledged that WO 01/52299 has also been considered.

**§ 112 Rejection**

The amendment to the claim is believed to obviate the rejection concerning the term “hygroscopic”.

**§ 103 Rejections**

Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokoyama et al. (US 2002/0007000) in view of Teijin Ltd. (JP 59045107), Jeram et al. (US 4340709) and Audsley (US 4929403).

As correctly noted by the Examiner, the hygroscopic plastic film is hydroscopic, before, during, and after the support is employed in the manufacture of the mold.

Teijin describes a polyester particle storage treatment to prevent water absorption during storage. “As soon as the particulate polyester is formed from its polymer, its surface layer, at least is crystallized. The crystallized surface layer prevents the polyester from having increased water content on storage and after drying just before melting.”

If only the surface layer of the polyester particles is crystallized, then the particulate polyester beneath the surface layer is uncrystallized, remaining capable of water absorption. Thus, once such polyester particles are melted and prepared into a film, the resulting film would also be capable of water absorption. Thus, crystallizing only the surface layer of polyester particles does not solve the problem of water absorption of a plastic film prepared from such particles.

In the method of the present invention, the plastic film is not “prevented” from water absorption. Rather, the water absorption is “maximized” when the plastic film “contains moisture to saturation at a temperature and a relative humidity at the time of use”. Hence, the present invention teaches away from the prevention of water absorption as described in Teijin.

As previously argued, if the particulate polyester particles are fully crystallized, i.e. not only the surface layer but also the core of each particle beneath the surface layer, then a film prepared from such polyester particles would be rendered incapable water absorption. Thus, such film would not meet the claim limitation of a “hygroscopic plastic film”. Further, there would be no motivation to subject such plastic film to “a humidity absorption treatment applied in advance” since such treatment would not affect the film.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

September 27, 2007

Date

By: /Carolyn A. Fischer/

Carolyn A. Fischer, Reg. No.: 39,091

Telephone No.: 651-575-3915

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833